

**Single Family Design Guidelines Update
Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Update**

Steering Committee

**Meeting #24 Notes
May 13, 2005**

Steering Committee members: Chair Dianne Channing, Bruce Bartlett, Joe Guzzardi, Bill Mahan, Helene Schneider, Richard Six.

Staff: Bettie Weiss (City Planner), Jaime Limón (Supervising Planner), Heather Baker (Project Planner), Jason Smart (Intern).

- I. Welcome and Introductions**
- II. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda.** (None)
- III. Administrative Items**
- IV. Steering Subcommittee Reports**

The FAR Steering Subcommittee did not report because both topics were to be discussed as part of agenda item V. The Story Pole Steering Committee had not met since the last Steering Committee meeting, results of their last meeting were expected to be published soon for full Steering Committee review.

V. Issue Paper J Part I: Triggers for Application Routing & Findings & Piece-meal Development

- a. Staff Presentation.** The Steering Committee asked a number of questions during the Staff presentation.
- b. Initial Steering Committee Discussion.** This item was skipped due to accommodate public comment in a more timely manner.
- c. Public Comment**

Claudia Madsen: Presented written correspondence (distributed in May 13th Steering Committee transmittal). Also, view protection findings should apply to projects in infill areas in addition to those in hillside areas.

Timothy Harding: Citywide Homeowners Association member. A 20-closest-homes analysis could be unfair because, for example, a single-story home surrounded by single-story homes could be held to different standards than two-story homes a few blocks away. The best standard for neighborhood compatibility in the Mesa would be “eclectic.” The NPO Update should lead to a maximum of flexibility. There has been a variety of opinions in public comment; not all commenters want strict standards.

Connie Hannah: League of Women Voters representative. Concurs with the recommendations in Claudia Madsen’s May 13th written correspondence. In the past, has supported a maximum FAR of 0.30 or 0.32 if garage space is

included in the calculations. If garage space is excluded, maximum FAR should not exceed 0.30. Garages on small lots should not exceed 450 square feet.

Michelle Giddens: Extending the length of time people are allowed to build after their projects receive ABR approval could prevent piece-mealing.

Cathie McCammon: Agrees with Claudia Madsen's comments. FARs should include garage space because they are supposed to convey the bulk of a structure.

Randy Mudge: ABR member. There need to be findings for when to allow projects to exceed 85% of the maximum FAR. Suggests lowering this tier to 75% or 80%. In the proposed finding #2 on page 18 of Issue Paper J, "compatibility" should be replaced by "proportionality," which is easier for the public to grasp. The proposed "Trees" finding on page 19 should say that all trees are preserved, not just native and mature ones. In the grading finding on page 19, "significant" alteration of the natural topography should be defined and should apply to infill projects. Exempting hillside additions less than 500 s.f. from ABR could encourage inappropriate grading. Architectural style should be a factor in determining compatibility. Small second stories can be just as inappropriate as large ones; design is more important than size. It is important to consider the size of a project when considering the number of times it was reviewed by ABR. There are many advantages to second stories, such as preserving open space and efficient land use.

d. Further Discussion

The Steering Committee discussed Draft FAR Table #7 and then passed the following motion.

Motion (by Bill Mahan): Make the following changes to the draft proposed FAR chart:

- ◆ Add garage allowance to the max. FAR number
- ◆ Readjust the allowances for lots over 20,000 s.f. so that max. home size decreases as lot size increases.
- ◆ Make sure the table has a clear note that it is only for two-story homes (after Staff completes lot coverage analysis for various lot sizes). Define two story as: "> 17' height" and "more than one level"
- ◆ Change lot size allowances to greater than or equal to 20,000 and less than 20,000, not 20,001 and 20,000

Second: Bruce Bartlett.

In favor: Bartlett, Mahan, Schneider, Six.

Opposed: Channing, Guzzardi.

VI. Review Upcoming Schedule

VII. Adjourn